



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/558.192	04/26/2000	Anuradha Narasimhaswamy	199-1408	9889

28395 7590 09/26/2006

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C./FGTL
1000 TOWN CENTER
22ND FLOOR
SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075-1238

EXAMINER

COLIN, CARL G

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2136

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/558,192	Applicant(s) NARASIMHASWAMY ET AL.	
	Examiner Carl Colin	Art Unit 2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 and 37-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 and 37-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>see att.</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 11/19/2004, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. In response to communications filed on 6/9/2004, Applicant amends claim 33 to recite approval by all inventors. The following claims 1-33, 37-41 are presented for examination. The USC 112 rejection of claim 33 has been withdrawn in view of the amended claim 33 filed on 6/9/2004. The arguments presented by Appellant in the brief have been considered but they are moot in view of a new ground of rejection.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 12, 16, 20, 27, and 33 and the intervening claims are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of copending application 09/681,242 now US Patent No. 7,069,592. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between the claims of the present application and the patent is locking the disclosure after the approvers approve the document. It would have been obvious to provide locking of the disclosure after approval so that no further changes can be made in this way a docket number is given to track the document as taught by Porcari. Another difference is that some claims are directed to a system instead of a method and it would have been obvious to implement the claimed method to an online system including user computer and server so that document from the central storage location can be made accessible to users through a network connection.

Claims 1, 12, 16, 20, 27, and 33 and the intervening claims are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims

1-41 of copending application 09/552,131. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between the claims of the present application and the patent is locking the disclosure after the approvers approve the document. It would have been obvious to provide locking of the disclosure after approval so that no further changes can be made in this way a docket number is given to track the document as taught in the 09/552,131 application disclosure.

Claims 1, 12, 16, 20, 27, and 33 and the intervening claims are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2-21 of copending application 09/563140. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the same subject matter is found in the claims and the slight difference in the language is not enough to patentably distinguish the claims. For instance, claims 1, 20, 27, and 33 of the present application recite central storage location whereas the claims of the copending application 09/563140 recite a database. The difference between claim 12 of the present application and claims 2-21 of copending application 09/563140 is that claim 12 prompts the user for password which is an obvious variation to control access of the document as taught in the disclosure of the copending application. Claim 16 recites second inventor whereas the copending application recites plurality of co-inventors, which is an obvious variation in the claimed language. Therefore the claims of both application are not patentably distinct from each other.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11, 20-32, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,315,504 to **Lemble** in view of US Patent 6,434,580 to **Takano**.

As per claim 1, **Lemble** substantially discloses an invention disclosure system comprising: forming an online disclosure by entering a plurality of selected information including a first inventor identification information from a user computer (see column 6, lines 35-36; column 10, lines 43-52; and abstract; and figures 15-16); as the plurality of selected information is entered into the user computer, storing the selected information in a central storage location (see column 5, lines 44-48 and abstract); prompting approval of said first inventor (see column 5, lines 21-25; column 9, lines 53-56; figures 4 and 6; and abstract); and after approval locking the disclosure to prevent further editing of the disclosure (see column 5, lines 33-40). **Lemble's** invention is directed to fill in forms electronically as the form is made available to many selected users for approval and modification based on predefined approval rules and requestor identity. **Lemble** discloses the invention with respect to users and approvers in a company setting for preparing an electronic disclosure or form, but does not specifically refer to the form as an invention disclosure which inherently is prepared by users that include inventors and patent law persons. It would have required merely routine skill in the art to replace

Art Unit: 2136

the users and approvers of **Lemble** by first/second inventor as it is well known that more than one inventor may be involved in a filing of an invention disclosure. **Takano** in an analogous art teaches preparing an online patent disclosure by inventor users with other patent application-filing persons including a patent attorney (see column 1, lines 1-19 and column 2, lines 1-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the invention of **Lemble** into an invention disclosure environment, by combining the electronic filing document approval system of **Lemble** with the features of filing an invention disclosure by inventors and patent attorneys as taught by **Takano** for the purpose of conveniently preparing a patent application via a transmission and reception of application data between the inventor and other patent application-filing users as suggested by **Takano** (see column 1, line 63 through column 2, line 10).

As per claim 2, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of further comprising the step of generating an approval log (see **Lemble**, column 10, lines 44-52).

As per claim 3, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of wherein the step of generating an approval log comprises recording the date of an approval (see **Lemble**, column 10, lines 44-52).

As per claim 4, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of further comprising associating the approval log with the disclosure (see **Lemble**, column 18, line

Art Unit: 2136

60 through column 19, line 14). **Lemble** discloses each document has an approval log associated with the document that can be view as a user selects the document.

As per claim 5, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of wherein forming is performed by a non-inventor author (see **Lemble**, column 5, lines 15-20 and column 14, lines 40-60).

As per claim 6, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of wherein the step of forming comprises identifying a second inventor; and further comprising the steps of notifying the second inventor; and, prompting the second inventor to approve the invention disclosure (see **Lemble**, column 18, lines 1-22; abstract, and figure 4).

As per claim 7, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of further comprising revising the disclosure by the second inventor to form a revised disclosure, and prompting the first inventor to approve the revised disclosure (see **Lemble**, column 20, line 40 through column 21, line 54).

As per claim 8, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of wherein prompting the second inventor comprises providing an E-mail to the second inventor (see **Lemble**, column 18, lines 1-22).

As per claim 9, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of wherein prompting comprises the step of prompting the approval of an associated document (see **Lemble**, column 5, lines 21-25; column 9, lines 53-56; figures 4 and 6; and abstract).

As per claim 10, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses wherein the associated document is selected from a group consisting of an assignment document, and a power of attorney. **Takano** teaches preparing an online patent application which implicitly or inherently includes assignment document and power of attorney (see **Takano**, column 19, lines 14-53). Therefore, claim 10 is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per claim 11, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of further comprising allowing access to various users for obtaining the information (see **Lemble**, column 5, lines 15-32 and abstract).

As per claim 20, **Lemble** substantially discloses an invention disclosure system comprising: forming an online disclosure by entering a plurality of selected information including a first inventor identification information and a second inventor identification information from a user computer (see column 6, lines 9-15; lines 35-36; column 10, lines 43-52; column 19, lines 50-55; column 20, lines 40-65; and abstract; and figures 15-16); as the plurality of selected information is entered into the user computer, storing the selected information in a central storage location (see column 5, lines 44-48; figures 3-4; and abstract); prompting approval of said first inventor (see column 5, lines 21-25; column 9, lines 53-56; figures 4 and 6;

Art Unit: 2136

and abstract); notifying the second inventor; and, prompting the second inventor to approve the invention disclosure (see **Lemble**, column 18, lines 1-22; abstract, and figure 4); and locking the disclosure to create a locked disclosure to prevent further editing of the disclosure when the second inventor approves the disclosure (see column 5, lines 33-40). **Lemble's** invention is directed to fill in forms electronically as the form is made available to many selected users for approval and modification based on predefined approval rules and requestor identity. **Lemble** discloses the invention with respect to users and approvers in a company setting for preparing an electronic disclosure or form, but does not specifically refer to the form as an invention disclosure which inherently is prepared by users that include inventors and patent law persons. It would have required merely routine skill in the art to replace the users and approvers of **Lemble** by first/second inventor as it is well known that more than one inventor may be involved in a filing of an invention disclosure. **Takano** in an analogous art teaches preparing an online patent disclosure by inventor users with other patent application-filing persons including a patent attorney (see column 1, lines 1-19 and column 2, lines 1-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the invention of **Lemble** into an invention disclosure environment, by combining the electronic filing document approval system of **Lemble** with the features of filing an invention disclosure by inventors and patent attorneys as taught by **Takano** for the purpose of conveniently preparing a patent application via a transmission and reception of application data between the inventor and other patent application-filing users as suggested by **Takano** (see column 1, line 63 through column 2, line 10).

Art Unit: 2136

As per claim 21, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of further comprising the step of generating an approval log (see **Lemble**, column 10, lines 44-52).

As per claim 22, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of wherein the step of generating an approval log comprises recording the date of an approval (see **Lemble**, column 10, lines 44-52).

As per claim 23, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of further comprising associating the approval log with the disclosure (see **Lemble**, column 18, line 60 through column 19, line 14). **Lemble** discloses each document has an approval log associated with the document that can be view as a user selects the document.

As per claim 24, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of further comprising locking the disclosure when the second inventor approves the disclosure (see **Lemble**, column 5, lines 33-40).

As per claim 25, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of further comprising locking the disclosure when the first inventor approves the revised disclosure (see **Lemble**, column 20, lines column 5, lines 33-40 and column 5, lines 33-40). **Lemble** discloses a revised disclosure can be sent to a first user for approval if the user is the last approver locking the disclosure may take place.

As per claim 26, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of wherein providing an E-mail to the second inventor comprises providing an E-mail to the second inventor having a hyperlink to the disclosure therein (see **Lemble**, column 18, lines 1-22 and abstract).

As per claim 27, **Lemble** substantially discloses an invention disclosure system comprising: forming an online disclosure by entering a plurality of information including one or more inventor identifications from one or more inventors to form an invention disclosure from a user computer (see column 6, lines 35-36; column 10, lines 43-52; and abstract; and figures 15-16); storing the information in a central storage location (see column 5, lines 44-48 and abstract); prompting approval of the one or more inventors (see column 5, lines 21-25; column 9, lines 53-56; figures 4 and 6; and abstract); and locking the disclosure to create a locked disclosure to prevent further editing of the disclosure after each of the one or more inventors approve the disclosure (see column 5, lines 33-40). **Lemble's** invention is directed to fill in forms electronically as the form is made available to many selected users for approval and modification based on predefined approval rules and requestor identity. **Lemble** discloses the invention with respect to users and approvers in a company setting for preparing an electronic disclosure or form, but does not specifically refer to the form as an invention disclosure which inherently is prepared by users that include inventors and patent law persons. It would have required merely routine skill in the art to replace the users and approvers of **Lemble** by first/second inventor as it is well known that more than one inventor may be involved in a filing of an invention disclosure. **Takano** in an analogous art teaches preparing an online patent disclosure by inventor users with

Art Unit: 2136

other patent application-filing persons including a patent attorney (see column 1, lines 1-19 and column 2, lines 1-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the invention of **Lemble** into an invention disclosure environment, by combining the electronic filing document approval system of **Lemble** with the features of filing an invention disclosure by inventors and patent attorneys as taught by **Takano** for the purpose of conveniently preparing a patent application via a transmission and reception of application data between the inventor and other patent application-filing users as suggested by Takano (see column 1, line 63 through column 2, line 10).

As per claim 28, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of further comprising the step of generating an approval log (see **Lemble**, column 10, lines 44-52).

As per claim 29, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of wherein the step of generating an approval log comprises recording the date of an approval from each of the one or more inventors (see **Lemble**, column 10, lines 44-52).

As per claim 30, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of further comprising associating the approval log with the disclosure (see **Lemble**, column 18, line 60 through column 19, line 14). **Lemble** discloses each document has an approval log associated with the document that can be view as a user selects the document.

As per claim 31, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of wherein prompting comprises prompting the one or more inventor comprises providing an E-mail to the one or more inventors having a hyperlink to the disclosure therein (see **Lemble**, column 18, lines 1-22 and abstract).

As per claim 32, the combination of **Lemble** and **Takano** discloses the limitation of wherein providing an E-mail to the one or more inventors comprises providing an E-mail to the one or more inventors having a hyperlink to the disclosure therein (see **Lemble**, column 18, lines 1-22 and abstract).

As per claim 41, **Lemble** substantially discloses the claimed method of claim 33. **Takano** teaches preparing an online patent application which implicitly or inherently includes assignment document and power of attorney (see **Takano**, column 19, lines 14-53). Therefore, claim 41 is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 12-19, 33, and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,315,504 to **Lemble**.

As per claim 12, **Lemble** discloses an invention disclosure system comprising a user computer, a web server having an identification subsystem, (see figure 1 and tables in column 7 and column 9); a database coupled to the server (see figure 1 and figure 3 and column 4, line 39). **Lemble** further discloses said server providing user screens to said users so users provide disclosure information to said server, (see figure 2 and claims 5-6); receiving disclosure information from said users, storing information in said database (see column 3, lines 40-62 and column 4, lines 25-47; and claim 1) and (see also column 29, lines 8-15; and figure 4); prompting a user to provide a password associated with the disclosure and allowing the access to said disclosure after storing said information in said database upon entering the password associated with the disclosure (see column 4, lines 3-11; column 25, lines 28-33; column 26, lines 58-65; and column 30, lines 45-55).

As per claim 13, **Lemble** discloses the claimed system of claim 12, further comprising a directory system coupled to said server whereby upon providing identification information to server said server retrieves user information from the directory system in response to the identification information (see column 25, lines 10-33 and figures 3-4).

As per claim 14, **Lemble** discloses the claimed system of claim 12, wherein said server creates a user log (see column (see column 10, lines 44-52).

As per claim 15, **Lemble** discloses the claimed system of claim 12, wherein said server associates said approval log with said disclosure (see column 10, lines 4-52).

As per claim 16, **Lemble** discloses an invention disclosure system comprising a user computer, a server, (see figure 1 and tables in column 7 and column 9); a database coupled to the server (see figure 1 and figure 3 and column 4, line 39). **Lemble** further discloses said server providing user screens to said users to prompt users to provide disclosure information to said server, (see figure 2 and claims 5-6); receiving disclosure information from said users, including a first inventor identification and a second inventor identification (see column 6, lines 9-15; column 19, lines 50-55; column 20, lines 40-65; and abstract); storing information in said database (see column 3, lines 40-62 and column 4, lines 25-47; column 29, lines 8-15; and figure 4); prompting the first inventor and the second inventor to provide an approval (see column 5, lines 20-40); locking the disclosure to prevent further editing after the approval by the first inventor and the second inventor (see column 5, lines 33-40).

As per claim 17, **Lemble** discloses the claimed system of claim 16, wherein said server generated an approval log associated with said disclosure (see column 10, lines 44-52).

As per claim 18, **Lemble** discloses wherein said server associates said approval log with said disclosure (see column 10, lines 4-52 and column 18, line 60 through column 19, line 14).

As per claim 19, **Lemble** discloses the claimed system of claim 16, further comprising a directory system coupled to said server whereby upon providing identification information to server said server retrieves user information from the directory system in response to the identification information (see column 25, lines 10-33 and figures 3-4).

As per claim 33, **Lemble** discloses an invention disclosure system comprising: forming an online disclosure by entering a plurality of selected information including a first user identification information from a user computer (see column 6, lines 35-36; column 10, lines 43-52; and abstract; and figures 15-16); storing the selected information in a central storage location (see column 5, lines 44-48 and abstract); prompting approval of said first user (see column 5, lines 21-25; column 9, lines 53-56; figures 4 and 6; and abstract); and generating an approval log comprising a date of approval by all inventors and associating the approval log with the document (see column 10, lines 44-52). **Lemble** discloses each document has an approval log associated with the document that can be view as a user selects the document (see column 18, line 60 through column 19, line 14).

As per claim 37, **Lemble** discloses further comprising the steps of notifying the second user; and, prompting the second user to approve the document (see column 18, lines 1-22; abstract, and figure 4).

As per claim 38, **Lemble** discloses revising the document by the second user to form a revised document, and prompting the first inventor to approve the revised document (see column 20, line 40 through column 21, line 54).

As per claim 39, **Lemble** discloses wherein prompting the second user comprises providing an E-mail to the second user (see column 18, lines 1-22).

As per claim 40, **Lemble** discloses locking the document when the second user approves the document (see column 5, lines 21-25; column 9, lines 53-56; figures 4 and 6; and abstract).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carl Colin whose telephone number is 571-272-3862. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:00-6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Art Unit: 2136

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

cc

Carl Colin
Patent Examiner
August 7, 2006

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100



9, 21, 06